UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Francis Neilson | Louis L. Mann | Curtis W. Reese

Scientists and Religion

By A. EUSTACE HAYDON

"Defensive Warfare"

By D. von EMBDEN

Militarizing the Etiquette of a Flag

By ALEXANDER HARVEY

The Story of My Experiments with Truth

Part IV, Chapters XXXV and XXXVI

By M. K. GANDHI

VOLUME CI | NUMBER 12

Chicago, May 21, 1928

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANCIS NEILSON LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY FELLOWSHIP

ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WAGNER, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.

Per Year, $1.00. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROGERS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Percy M. Dawson
David Starr Jordan
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
ENGLAND—Harrison Brown, Fred Hankinson, Walter Walsh
CANADA—Norman T. Dowd
FRANCE—G. Demartial, Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Guglielmo Lusidi
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoha
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY

A Journal of the Religion of Democracy

Editors:

John Haynes Holmes — Francis Neilson
Curtis W. Reese — Louis L. Mann

UNITY is a weekly paper, sixteen pages, containing timely editorial comment, special articles, foreign correspondence by its own representatives in Europe and Asia, book reviews, and regular reports of news from the field of liberal thought and action.

UNITY was the first American paper to discover Gandhi, of India. When the great Mahatma was unknown even to newspapers, UNITY hailed him as "the greatest man in the world." Its files contain the most complete record of Gandhi and his work that exists in this country. His autobiography, "The Story of My Experiments with Truth" is now appearing in weekly installments.

UNITY was the first American paper to espouse and advocate the Outlawry of War, that remarkable peace program that is challenging the attention of the world.

UNITY has for more than forty years championed the idea of universal religion which finds in freedom the secret of unity and brotherhood, and it is today the outstanding organ of world religion.

Sample copies on request.

$3.00 per year.

700 Oakwood Boulevard **CHICAGO**

Contents

Page

EDITORIAL—
Notes 215
Scientists and Religion—A. EUSTACE HAYDON.. 217
Jottings—J. H. H. 218
Editorial Correspondence: American Notes —SYDNEY STRONG 219

ARTICLES—
Germany Accepts Outlawry—*Herr Stresemann* 215
"Defensive War"—D. VON EMBDEN 221
Militarizing the Etiquette of a Flag—ALEXANDER HARVEY 222
Causes in Evolution—DAVID STARR JORDAN.... 223
The Story of My Experiments with Truth —Part IV—Chapters XXXV and XXXVI— M. K. GANDHI 224

POETRY—
Black Roads—DOROTHY LEONARD 220

THE STUDY TABLE—
Spanish America—FREDERICK STARR 225
An Anthology of Obscure Poets—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 226

THE FIELD—
International Crime 227
A French Petition 228

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME CI MONDAY, MAY 21, 1928 NUMBER 12

GERMANY ACCEPTS OUTLAWRY

The German Government welcomes most warmly the opening of negotiations for the conclusion of an international pact for the outlawry of war. The two main ideas which lie at the bottom of the initiative of the French Foreign Minister, and the resulting proposal of the Government of the United States, correspond completely with the principles of German policy.

Germany has no higher interest than to see the possibility of armed conflicts eliminated and a development assured in the life of nations which would guarantee the peaceful settlement of all international disputes. The conclusion of a pact such as the United States now has in view would certainly bring the nations a good deal nearer to this goal. . . .

The German Government can accordingly declare that it is ready to conclude a pact in accordance with the proposal of the Government of the United States, and to this end to enter into the necessary negotiations with the Governments concerned.

To this declaration the German Government adds, moreover, its definite expectation that the realization of a pact of such importance will not fail to make its influence felt forthwith on the state of international relations. Therefore, this new guarantee for the maintenance of peace must give a real impulse to the efforts for the carrying out of general disarmament.

And, further still, the renunciation of war must as a necessary complement enlarge the possibilities of settling in a peaceful way the existing and potential conflicts of national interests.

Herr Stresemann to Secretary Kellogg.

"Pacifism" is coming into its own! We would not urge this ourselves, for we know the odium that has so long (and so unfairly!) been attached to this word, and we would not therefore wantonly apply the word to any movement whose progress we would advance. Furthermore, we have no pride of opinion on our own side, and care not whether a victory for pacifism be registered as such or not, so long as the victory itself is real and secure. But it is other people who are talking about pacifism these days! Statesmen and publicists who would not soil their lips or pens with the epithet are now using it as a badge of honor in connection with Secretary Kellogg's Outlawry proposals. Here, for example, is the editorial statement published in the London *Observer* of April 15th last, written by its great editor, Mr. Garvin (see UNITY, May 7th):

> The word "pacifism" is its own worst enemy. None the less, it has to be rehabilitated. Mr. Kellogg bids fair to rehabilitate it. For the first time in diplomatic history, a first-class power has made a move towards undiluted, unqualified pacifism in world affairs. It promises to enable a distracted world to take its first business-like step towards settled peace.

This statement is matched by one from the Manchester *Guardian* of April 20th last:

> The American proposal for the simple, total and general abolition of war has been received in London with what Whitehall describes as a warm welcome. . . . If the United States, the richest nation, and therefore the most powerful diplomatic influence, offers to take part in a blind undertaking to be pacifist—blind because no mention is made of "sanctions"—then pacifism becomes for the first time a practicable policy.

Again are "the children of this world wiser than the children of light." Hard-headed men of the world are seeing what many professional pacifists are refusing to see—that Secretary Kellogg's Outlawry program is pacifism of the extreme idealistic type, and "practicable" not in spite of but *because* of this fact. We are being justified in spite of ourselves! Pacifism is being "rehabilitated" by those who have presumed to hate it most.

The more we ponder the situation, the more we feel concern over France's attitude in the pending Outlawry situation. In every other direction, things are going splendidly. Germany has accepted Mr. Kellogg's proposed treaty outlawing war, without imposing any reservations of any kind. Every report seems to indicate that the British government is wholly favorable. In addition, the British Labor Party has formally endorsed the treaty, and urged action favorable to its adoption. But France is nervous, as see her touchiness over Ambassador Schurman's praise of Germany for accepting the Kellogg treaty. And France, the very nation which opened negotiations, is now offering difficulties in the way of closing them, as see the reservations laid down by M. Briand in his last communication. The American Secretary of State has done his best to minimize the importance of these reservations, and has achieved a great and useful diplomatic victory in so doing. But the fact remains that certain of these French reservations are loop-holes through which the dogs of war may escape to harry the world anew. Take the phrase, for example, "The Outlawry of War shall be applied only to personal private war undertaken by a power spontaneously and of its own initiative without treaty justification." To what war in modern times could this be applied? And how, under Outlawry, can we imagine "treaty justification" for war? Again, under the French terms, war is not to be outlawed in certain specific cases. The first of these is that of "legitimate defense," which raises the whole silly ques-

tion of defensive war. It was under just this pretext of "legitimate defense" that all the nations, even the United States three thousand miles away, plunged into the Great War. Another case of exception is that of "legitimate defense in the framework of existing treaties." This permits war on the occasion of violation of treaty rights. These and similar reservations show that the French are missing the point, or deliberately refusing to see it. "It is somewhat difficult," says Robert Dell in the Manchester *Guardian,* "to imagine a case of war that would not in one way or another escape the ban" as thus interpreted by France. This way, be very sure, lies failure!

The Levinson-Borah-Kellogg program of Outlawry is the one and only way of saving the League of Nations. This the Outlawry advocates have always understood. Accused of being unfriendly to the League, they have simply insisted upon pointing out that the League could not hope to function as an agency of peace unless the existing war system is abolished. The Leaguers, on the other hand, have insisted that, war system or no war system, the League can accomplish peace, which is precisely like saying that, water or no water, a fish can swim. Now comes General Smuts, one of the makers of the League, to confess the truth! The League of Nations, he says, has not fulfilled the hopes of its founders, and has become utterly "untenable" in the mesh of post-war European politics.

> Today (is his statement as reported in a cable despatch to the New York *Times*), many of us are disappointed. The world as a whole is disappointed with the achievement of the League of Nations. . . . During its history to date, the League of Nations has not responded to the highest hopes of those who founded it.

The abstention of the United States, he points out, was a serious blow. But now the United States comes "with a proposal far more drastic than that which President Wilson proposed." The Outlawry program, in other words, is not unfriendly to the League, but the one thing which the League must have to make it a success. The real friends of the League are not those who would sustain it to its own ultimate destruction by the war forces of the world, but those who would strengthen it and reestablish it by destroying the power of these forces to do evil. So General Smuts, greatest living champion of the League of Nations, supports the Kellogg proposals. Let the American League of Nations folk hasten to do likewise!

What an age for breaking records! A flying record, thanks to the dauntless heroism of men, is being smashed almost every week. Automobiles are also holding their own—as witness the breath-taking 207 miles an hour in Florida some weeks ago. Then we recall that some woman or other stayed afloat in water longer than any person in human history—longer even than a sea-lion who was put into the tank to compete with her. The Prince of Wales holds all records for an heir to an imperial throne tumbling from a horse, and is adding to his own unprecedented total of achievements almost weekly. The champion heavyweight of the world lectures on Shakespeare at Yale, and a three-year-old baby smokes cigars—surely new records both. A toad in Texas lived in the corner-stone of a building without food, water or air for thirty years, and a spider in Nebraska did the same in a cement foundation for almost as long a time. Surely these feats are unparalleled. Now "Babe" Ruth is out to beat his home-run record, flag-pole sitters will soon be shooting at the zenith, and throughout the summer athletes by the hundreds will be competing for ever higher and higher marks of attainment, and beating them not a few. What a people we are, and what an age this is! But it all impresses us, at least in matters of this kind, that much of the activity of life is futile, and men's interest in it silly. What matters it how fast an automobile can travel, or how long or far a woman can swim? Why should the ability of a beefy bruiser to hit a baseball for a circuit clout be the one most important fact in a nation's life, or the smoking of a cigar by an infant take the front page on every newspaper in the land? Even this repeated ocean-flying seems to be something done rather crazily for its own sake than for some high end of human happiness and progress. Sensation—the mad rush from exploit to exploit—hysteria all the time over something scandalous, or daring, or horrible, or just plain ridiculous. Yes, we may be getting on. But meanwhile, "what fools we mortals be."

Some good citizen in every American community should have at hand for all occasions a copy or copies of the Federal Council's "Information Service" for May 5th, 1928. It is 12-page quarto of rather fine print reviewing the propaganda of the ardent patrioteers who have inspired not alone the black-list of the Daughters of the American Revolution but a whole torrent of garbled and malicious stuff about American "reds," and their so-called subversive activities. Voluminous as the matter is, the showing is very meager indeed, compared with all the evidence, of how these patrioteers can muddle and misrepresent. The reader wonders whether he should laugh most over their blunders, or most cry out against their malice. This document should prove an effectual answer among all sincere spirits to the campaign of the D. A. R., and the Legion, and the numerous military organizations, official and other, who have been so zealous since the War to prevent the American people from facing squarely and sanely the national and international problems of the day. If it be true that "whom they would destroy the gods first make mad," the gods must have been very busy with these patrioteers. That they have gone clean,

stark mad is the most charitable construction to be put upon their campaign. They simply do not know what they are talking about much of the time. They make the most ludicrous blunders in the use of such terms as "Socialist," "Communist," "red," "revolutionary," "subversive." They classify prominent Americans in the most incongruous groups, and attribute to well-known organizations aims and motives which the least informed general reader knows to be ridiculous. They misspell the names of persons familiar to most school boys. And out of this welter one of the most flagrant garblers emits the assurance that in 20 years no one "has presented a single line of evidence to disprove a statement of fact by me!" It is all impossible. But get this document and read for yourself!

The Negro is getting his political chance. Little enough, to be sure, but more and better than he has had since the parlous reconstruction days which enabled him to put a few not always creditable representatives temporarily into Congress. He was long ago robbed of political power throughout the south. The more recent migrations to northern cities have assembled Negroes in sufficient numbers here and there to promise concerted political action. The situation upon which the eyes of the nation now rest is that in Chicago, where the richest congressional district, the New York Wall Street district excepted, is now under the control of Negro voters. From it the veteran Congressman Madden has been sent to Washington for something like a generation. Though the population has gradually changed during his public life, the growing Negro population showed its good sense and loyal citizenship by continuing him in office, to serve, not merely a district, but the nation, by his recognized statesmanship. Now that he is dead a Negro representative is logical. Whom shall he be? Level-headed Negro leaders continue to show their good sense and good citizenship by refusing to approve a typical ward-boss who aspires to the place, apparently willing to split the Negro vote, if necessary, to the point of losing a racial representative altogether, rather than allow the race to be misrepresented at this critical time in Congress. In this they are wise, and their good citizenship will be commended by all other good citizens. A Negro Congressman of high character and real statesmanship can render a monumental service to the Negro; a cheap, truckling, ward-boss can only set back Negro political progress indefinitely. A similar opportunity already presents itself to the Negroes of Harlem in New York City. In other northern cities other chances are developing. Let the Negro not fail to put his best foot forward. Only the best of the race can truly serve in these situations. And the best can do wonders.

Scientists and Religion

Leaders of all the great religions in our age are accepting as the central task of religion the realization of the good life in a good world. This involves coming to terms with modern scientific knowledge, facing the evils of social maladjustment and the quest of a program capable of embodying ideal human relationships in social structure. A vital religion is always a synthesis of worldview, ideals and program emerging as an indigenous product of the life situation to which it offers guidance, challenge and hope. Roman Catholic writers never cease to remind us of the perfect synthesis of the thirteenth century when all life was oriented under the aegis of religion.

The achievement of such a religious synthesis of scientific knowledge and democratic, social ideals in the western world is a problem peculiarly difficult. For several centuries science and religion have been conscious of estrangement. This was unfortunate, not for science but for mankind. The arbitrary barrier of religion, the product of the past experience of the race, interpreted once for all as infallible truth, made impossible the normal and natural development of religious thinking and program in living relationship with the whole movement of life. The result was a dualism, —on the one hand, a science-made civilization dominating the life of man yet with no recognized responsibility or loyalty to religious idealism and, on the other, a religion clinging to the thought forms and attitudes of the past with no vital philosophy of life or machinery for the solution of the practical problems of living in this world. To continue to maintain that dualism today is not only needless but dangerous. The threat of modern civilization to the values of the higher life of man is too serious to neglect.

It would be a strange turn of cosmic irony if the generation best equipped in knowledge and practical technique to actualize the religious ideal should be so entangled in the fetters of the religion of their fathers as to be incapable of creating a religion to vitalize their own age. The intellectual atmosphere of today is the result of scientific knowledge. The peculiar problems which perplex the religious leaders are products of the technology which science has made possible. Nothing could be more reasonable than to expect that the scientists would be leaders in the labor of formulating a worldview and life program for the religious synthesis of the modern world.

As a matter of fact, the contribution of the scientists to religious leadership in our generation is disappointing. Many are completely indifferent and their

attitude is comprehensible. Identifying religion with the theology of supernaturalism they are through with it because they are convinced it is through. Unable to believe, they accept with smiling complacency the charge of the faithful that they are irreligious. To be vigorously anti-religion might be more hopeful than this attitude of indifference which detaches so many of our most brilliant men from the religious quest.

Perhaps more discouraging are those scientists who come to the defense of religion. Carrying the immense prestige of their renown as scientists, moderno-fundamentalist in their religious thinking, without special training in the history of thought, they are an embarrassment to those who are endeavoring to make religious ideals and loyalties integral to the thinking and life of the world we know. They continue the emphasis of fundamentalism upon belief. They write and speak as though the differentia of religion lay in a certain minimum of doctrinal assurance, in terms of traditional Christianity, as to a transcendant world of reality, while the whole movement of modern religion is toward making the test of religious loyalty in terms of a way of living rather than a way of thinking. Any student of the religious sciences knows that religion is a quest of the values of life and that the emphasis of Christianity upon doctrinal belief is an accident of our own history and not an essential of religions generally.

That they resort to rationalizing in the effort to establish the reasonableness of the fundamentals of the traditional theology is natural. This process is interesting as a work of art in itself and scientists turned apologists might be an attractive addition to our culture. But even in this they are disappointing for their arguments only serve to show that they have altogether neglected the brilliant rationalizing that has taken place in the religious philosophies of the last century. Arguments that theologians have discarded a generation ago are not convincing revelations because they fall from the lips of scientists.

A more serious criticism is that the men of science so consistently fail to carry over into their treatment of religion the scientific attitude of mind. Arguments from authority are usually considered negligible in science yet scientists use them in religious demonstrations. How they can expect them to carry conviction to those who are not already convinced is not clear.

One of the common statements of such defenders of religion is that the realms of science and religion are incommensurable. This is tantamount to saying that religious facts are not data capable of being handled by scientific method. The logic of this position leads to one of two conclusions,—either agnosticism or acceptance of religious ideas and ideals on blind faith. To accept either conclusion is to renounce the hope of achieving a living religion for the twentieth century. As a means of quieting the fears of fundamentalists it may serve. As a challenge to modern youth it fails completely.

The most serious difficulty with the position of the scientists on religion is that they neglect the findings of the religious sciences of the last three decades. These sciences have shown the developmental nature of all ideas and institutions and their functional relationship to the life situations of people engaged in a serious effort to win the satisfactions of a worthful life. Modern leaders of religions, the world over, are aware of this and are striving to use scientific method in the effort to win a world-view and life-view which, channelled in program and institution, will make this world a satisfying home for man.

"We shall use the sciences," says Professor Hu-Shih in projecting the program of social idealism for the new China. Science may open windows of hope or deluge the world with despair. The cause of religion needs the scientists. They must be the specialists in the creation of the Great Society of the future. But they must begin to live religiously in this world. To hope to win a culture instinct with religious idealism by loyalty to medievalism is futile.

A. Eustace Haydon.

Jottings

Four months of this current year 1928 have passed without a lynching. It looks as though this foulest of all American crimes were disappearing.

We think we have found New York's bravest man. Surely he is the man who, stripped of his trousers in his store by a sneak-thief, nevertheless pursued the thief through the open streets until the latter was captured. Reports indicate that the trouserless hero's run back to the store was faster than his run from it. None the less, he was the bravest of men.

The Ford Hall Forum in Boston has been repudiated by its backers, the Baptist Social Union. Now let them be consistent and repudiate the Old South Church, Boston Common, Bunker Hill, Lexington and Concord! There's nothing like finishing a job when it is once begun.

Sacco and Vanzetti will not down! The latest statement of their case appears in Arthur Garfield Hays's new book, "Let Freedom Ring," which will be reviewed in due season in our columns.

We never thought we would agree with John Roach Straton on anything. But he says:

> I hope for a drawing together of God's children on the

basis of greater faith, and not on the basis of religious denomination. I believe there will come a day when Christian unity is at hand, and when denominational tags and names will be cut off.

These are our sentiments precisely. Any attempt to apply them would probably lead to differences right off, but here's a common goal at least!

A cat may look at a king—and so may a Bolshevik! The Ameer of Afghanistan had a good time in Moscow. J. H. H.

American Notes

(Editorial Correspondence.)

Some New England Women of the 17th Century

In my rambles along the Connecticut Valley—in libraries, churches and grave-yards, while also chatting with the present generation, I have discovered some remarkable women, of whom I had never heard. And why should we ever hear, since the men have written the histories, kept the diaries; and the lines of genealogy have been run according to masculine compasses. It has been thought sufficiently difficult to keep track for several generations back of one's father's name. The woman's name doesn't seem to count. Rarely is the genealogy of one of the girls followed out for more than a couple of links.

I have also noticed that people are quite willing to acknowledge relationship with a celebrated person of whatever name. When I discovered that on the ship, "Mary and John," that arrived in America May 30, 1630, on which was my progenitor, John Strong, then a young man of 25, there was also a Thomas Ford, and four Ford girls, naturally, I wondered if Henry Ford had any connection with this Thomas Ford. I doubt if he knows what I am about to tell, for, entirely apart from Henry Ford, those four Ford girls have been gradually working into my consciousness, as remarkable girls. The fact that my ancestor, John, married one of them naturally has added zest to my search as to what became of the Ford girls who sailed on the "Mary and John" from Plymouth, England, March 12, 1630, and landed at what is now Dorchester, May 30, 1630. (I suggest it as a theme for magazine writer, poet, or for some post-graduate of Smith or Vassar, working for a degree. The search would be as interesting as searching for Captain Kidd's treasure.)

In mentioning a few facts regarding the Ford sisters that have come to light in my strolls and reading, I must bring in some men—the men whom they married. Otherwise, the historian would have entirely overlooked them. It is said that great care was taken in gathering together the company that came on the boat, that the material should compose a well-ordered settlement, to contain all the elements of an independent community. Thomas Ford is mentioned as one of several gentlemen past middle life, with adult families and good estates. The first daughter, Joanna by name, married Roger Clap (spelled "Clapp" by his children). They lived together for 57 years. Roger was a young fellow on the voyage and was the rather famous author of a "Diary" that throws much light upon the affairs of early New England. He was a pillar in the Dorchester church for about 60 years. He became a "Captain"—kept the Castle, and was buried with great honors. Their eldest son, Preserved, went to Northampton, Mass., in 1660 and was one of the leaders in that important town and church. He was Ruling Elder for 20 years in the church which a few years later called Jonathan Edwards as pastor. In 1870 the Clapps had a reunion in Northampton, representing many thousands of the descendants of Roger Clap and Joanna Ford—among them being scores of people important in the making of New England and the West.

My ancestor, John Strong, succeeded in capturing the second Ford sister, whose name was Abigail. If I do say it, they had a remarkable record. And, judging by the Strongs I know, she was quite equal to John. I note one common mark about the Ford girls' husbands—they became deacons or Ruling Elders. That speaks volumes for the girls and their piety. John and Abigail lived together for 50 years. When the Strong family history was published in 1870, there were 37,000 descendants to their credit. I have told my readers before that their seven sons lived to attain on the average 80 years of age, with families averaging twelve. And their eight daughters had families nearly as large. This Abigail Ford undoubtedly had influence in two important parsonages, since her son married one of the Windsor, Conn., minister's daughters, and her husband was ruling elder in the Northampton church, where the pastor's wife was a niece. Among those 37,000 Strongs scattered all over the earth are farmers, lawyers, teachers, carpenters, governors, bankers, preachers, editors, ordinary workers—the most of them having a strong leaning to being respectable. My father once said that he did not know a Strong who had been in jail, or who didn't vote the Republican ticket. Rather questionable respectability.

The third Ford sister, Hepzibah, married Richard Lyman. As a result there are so many Lymans in New England that they have to name streets after them. Richard is described as a "man of decided character," came with the earliest company to Northampton, was one of the "townsmen" in 1655. His homestead lay right next to the first pastor's—Rev. Eleazar Mather. As to the descendants of Richard and Hepzibah, I may mention the famous Joseph Hawley of pre-Revolutionary fame, whose words Patrick Henry thought worth quoting, and a man of great influence in Western Massachusetts.

The fourth Ford girl (history records no other) married Major Aaron Cook. They were last, but not least, by any means. He was a man of great energy and "a devoted friend to the regicides, Goffe and Whalley, whom the officers of the King for years sought to arrest." They were married at Windsor in 1640 and moved to Northampton in 1661. He was called upon to serve in nearly all the functions of the early settlement—deacon, tythingman, selectman, etc. You see that Cooks, Strongs, Clapps, Lymans were half brothers by marriage—having married the Ford girls. They all settled at Northampton at about the same time—it being for 100 years the most influential center in that

region. If anyone should say that the Fords were not forceful women, the facts mentioned would contradict him. They had large families. They were all prominent in the church. Abigail Ford's daughter, Abigail, married Rev. Nathaniel Chauncey, Hatfield. She was the mother of the Rev. Nathaniel Chauncey, 60 years pastor at Durham. The Fords—as wives and heads of families—had the run of the parsonage at Northampton when the first pastor's wife, Esther Warham Mather, came, and as long as they lived must have been intimate with her during the 77 years of her service as pastor's wife, first as Mrs. Mather, and then as Mrs. Solomon Stoddard—and this woman was the grandmother of Jonathan Edwards, whom John Fiske names as "one of the wonders of the world, probably the greatest intelligence that the western hemisphere has yet seen."

This leads me to speak of Esther Warham—his grandmother, who lived practically all her life in Northampton—the scene of his labors—and was either pastor's wife—77 years—or grandmother of the pastor, in this case Jonathan Edwards. In the first place she was born in a parsonage, that of Rev. John Warham, who headed the company, as pastor, that came in 1630 on the "Mary and John." This company remained at what is now Dorchester, Mass., but in 1635 the most of the company, with him at the head, trekked through the wilderness into Connecticut and established the town of Windsor. In 1930 these two towns, Dorchester and Windsor, will be shooting off fire works—each claiming the original church of 1630, whose founders came on the "Mary and John." John Warham was an able and godly man. He, however, leaves the story here, save to say that Esther was one of his daughters.

When Esther was seventeen or eighteen along came a young man who expected to be a minister, Eleazar Mather, who graduated at Harvard at nineteen. He was son of Richard Mather and brother of Increase Mather—the Mathers being the most important family in all New England—and they were married, 1659. The young couple went into the wilderness and organized the Northampton church in 1661. They lived together for ten years, when he was removed by death. In a couple of years Rev. Solomon Stoddard was ordained as the minister. He married Mrs. Mather. Hence the name Esther Warham Mather Stoddard. I may say that he was a very able man, one of the ablest in New England, who used to take on Increase Mather every now and then for a debate. Under his long pastorate the church mightily prospered. . . . Esther Warham was the mother of 15 children. . . . Six of her girls married ministers (a fact that weighed more then than now). 1, Eunice married Rev. John Williams of Deerfield. Here is a long Indian story, the murder of Eunice, the captivity of part of the family, the marriage of one of the children, who was held in captivity, to an Indian chief. 2, Esther in 1694 married Rev. Timothy Edwards of East Windsor, Conn. They lived together for 63 years in this one pastorate. They had as children one boy and ten girls. The one boy was Jonathan Edwards. They were educated alike by their father. Jonathan graduated from Harvard, taking his A. B. in the A. M., and A. M. in the P. M. The mother of Jonathan lived to be 99. She was distinguished by superior mental powers, intellectual achievements and deep piety. (Note that this is Esther Warham's daughter.) 3, Mary in 1695 married Rev. Stephen Mix, for 44 years at Newington, Conn. 4, Christina in 1699 married Rev. William Williams of Hatfield, who was a cousin to Rev. John Williams. 5, Sarah in 1707 married Rev. Samuel Whitman of Farmington, Conn., where he was pastor for 44 years. 6, Hannah in 1712 married Rev. William Williams of Western Massachusetts. A goodly number of ministers sprang from these six families.

Esther Warham, or her descendants, occupied the parsonage of the Northampton church for over 150 years—she starting with 77 years, her grandson, Jonathan, 23, and Rev. Solomon Williams for 56 years. The long line of distinguished Americans that is named the "Edwards line" may be credited as much to Esther Warham—perhaps more—as to any one else.

Her career is very dramatic—lending itself to a play of the imagination. Esther Warham, a slip of a girl under 20 when she came from the parsonage in Windsor, Conn., bride of the young minister, Eleazar Mather. Organizing a church. Drawing after her such women as the Ford sisters, who with their husbands were in the prime of life, starting some of the first families of the important community. After three children were born, her husband was taken. This was the time when Increase Mather, a brother of her husband, came from Boston to Northampton, to help, was taken ill, nearly died, the church fasting and praying for his recovery. He was in the parsonage for three months before he could return. I have the intuition that this "most important Puritan" must have given and received much inspiration. . . . Then the marriage to Solomon Stoddard. It is accepted that her influence over Dr. Stoddard was spiritually stimulating. He died at the age of 86, in 1729—with her remaining in the parsonage until 1736. Meantime her to be distinguished grandson, Jonathan Edwards, only a boy then, came to be the pastor, first as associate to Dr. Stoddard and then at the death of Dr. Stoddard to take full charge—occupying the parsonage some 9 years of his ministry before she died. The church then numbered 600 members, perhaps the largest in New England. She had been under the same roof with her grandson, from 1727 to 1736—at which later date Jonathan Edwards was but 33.

Of all the women of New England, for the first 100 years of its history, I think of no one whom I would place above Esther Warham as expressing the highest ideals of the Puritan—self-control, self-diagnosis, belief in and obedience to God, and the rights and responsibilities of conscience in human conduct. Besides, of course, is her personal ability and influence even to many generations.

SYDNEY STRONG.

Black Roads

Black roads eat up the light, my dear,
Black roads eat up the sky.
Then build your road of white, my dear,
To steer your car at night, my dear,
And keep you safe from fright, my dear,
When comets canter by.

DOROTHY LEONARD.

"Defensive War"

The history of the negotiations between the United States and France concerning a treaty for the outlawry of war is well known. The American Minister Kellogg made the proposal to the French government as an outcome of the scheme to outlaw war which Senator Borah has presented to the American government and which aims to disestablish war as an honorable and legal means for obtaining international justice and morality, and to establish in its place international law, by which means disarmament, security and effective arbitration can finally be evolved. M. Briand suggested a limitation. "Only aggressive war can be outlawed," he said.

It has not yet penetrated the minds of French politicians that the difference between the two kinds of war, "aggressive" and "defensive," has become entirely chimerical; and that preparations for a war of defence not only fail to give a country security but positively increase its danger. Caught as she is in a network of "defensive" alliances, so dear to the short-sighted European tradition, France cannot yet see that the utter failure of that system to secure peace has been fully proved. But the eyes of the American government are apparently open to this fact, and it was unable to accept M. Briand's restriction that defensive wars must remain lawful. And there the negotiations closed, upon what should be a note of hope for sincere peace workers. Mr. Kellogg's attitude is right. The principle of the outlawry of war must not be devitalized by any restrictions from the ante-bellum period.

"But why," ask those who are still unable to envisage a warless world and who are still hypnotized by military force, "should wars of defence not be permissible?"

The first reason lies in the nature of modern means of warfare. Quickly and easily movable forces are indispensable, even to the "defending" nation, and it may well happen in the case of a small state with easily crossed frontiers, that to "attack" is its only hope of "defence." The party which is first in invading the territory of the other state need by no means be the "aggressor" in the political sense. It is hardly necessary to enlarge upon this argument. How easily the defending state would be convinced of the necessity for a "defensive attack" as a little more prevention, is obvious. The system is perfect in producing *insecurity*.

By what definition then shall "aggressor" and "defender" be known?

The Geneva protocol of 1924 claimed to have a conclusive definition. "The aggressor is the party which rejects arbitration and (after a conflict has broken out) an armistice, and proceeds with its military operations" —in other words, the aggressor is he who wages war without any further qualification. But this amounted practically to complete outlawry which was counteracted, however, in defining defensive wars. Here consideration would have to be given to the moral justification for force, i. e., whether the state sought acquisition of territory and power or was merely protecting its honor and interests.

History is so full of examples of how this lawful "self defence" has been exploited that it should be perfectly plain to all who have eyes to see that until brute force has been completely renounced as an instrument in international affairs, peace cannot be ensured.

Let us review some of these examples.

In 1859 France concluded a purely offensive alliance with Sardinia-Piedmont, with the object of driving Austria out of northern Italy. In what respect did this concern France? Simply that Napoleon the Third saw an opportunity to annex Nice and Savoy for France: *"le premier 'vol' de l'aigle."* The treaty, therefore, was clearly one of aggression since it had for its object the acquisition of territory. However, on the completion of the treaty, Sardinia almost immediately began to mobilize, and Austria, considering herself menaced, delivered an ultimatum demanding the demobilization of the Sardinian army. This demand was refused and Austria opened hostilities. That Austria was the first to attack does not in any way change the fact that the real aggressor was Sardinia, and in a still higher degree, France. But M. Baroche, explaining the matter from the French standpoint, said: "France has neither sought nor desired war. She was obliged to fight because her ally, Sardinia, had been attacked by Austria." Further comment upon this defensive war is hardly necessary.

In 1866, when proclaiming the war between Prussia and Austria, King Wilhelm I, of Prussia, said: "I have done everything to save Prussia from the suffering and sacrifices of war. God and my people know that this is so. But Austria does not desire peace and we have no choice; we must fight for our very existence." Yet some years later, General Von Moltke, writing in his diary concerning the same event, said: "The cause of the war in 1866 was not that Prussia's existence was menaced, nor was it the result of public opinion. It was a war which had been deliberately planned for many years and its sole object was to make Prussia the supreme state in Germany."

In 1877, supplementary to a treaty which had existed for some years between Italy, Germany and Austria, the two first-mentioned countries, entered into a secret alliance which stipulated that: In the event of France taking possession of Morocco or Tripoli, Germany should declare Italy justified in attacking France and annexing French territory, in order to secure its (Italy's) position in the Mediterranean. Having thus put Italy in a lawful "defensive" position, Germany must come to her assistance under the terms of the alliance.

In 1902 France completed a secret treaty with Italy, by which both parties "bound themselves to observe neutrality towards each other," not only in the event of either becoming the victim of direct or indirect aggression (as in the case already cited of France and Sardinia) but also in the event of one or the other being obliged to take the initiative in a war in defence of its honor or security. Since under a system which recognizes the right of force and glorifies arms and the implements of war, any armed country must inevitably regard every other armed country as a menace to its own honor and security, "wars of defence" may spring up over night, such a treaty could not long remain idle.

When Russia felt an irresistible desire to possess Constantinople (as a burglar sometimes feels an irresistible desire to possess the contents of another man's

safe) the late Minister Sazonof let it be known that "Russia would shortly be called upon to *defend* her interest in the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles!"

This, then, is clear. Wars of aggression simply will not occur any more. But holy, sanctified wars of defence must still be considered the duty of every nation which would defend its honor and security—and incidentally annex what it can!

But the chicanery of imperialism makes all things possible. Was England's occupation of Egypt in 1881 aggressive? Undoubtedly! "But," it is explained, "it was necessary to *defend* the interests of British traders and investors, and especially for the protection of the route to India." Was her repeated intervention and domination in Afghanistan; her disguised division of Persia in 1907 in conjunction with Russia, aggressive policy? Of course it was. Yet these proceedings were approved by a great proportion of the English public for the reason that English domination in the "borderlands" was considered indispensable for the protection and "defence" of India!

Yet Europe still looks to military force for protection, and refuses to see the necessity to renounce the whole institution of war which the American scheme of Outlawry is urging.

D. VON EMBDEN,
Member, Netherlands Senate.
The Hague, Holland.

Militarizing the Etiquette of a Flag

The struggle proceeding between the militarists and the pacifists over the etiquette of the American flag might be likened to the battle of William Tyndale with the Oxford dons for the right to read the New Testament in his native tongue. There is much in the course of American militarists to remind us of what happened to the widowed mother who was burned alive for teaching her children the Lord's prayer, the apostle's creed and the ten commandments in English.

For the American militarists are completely fanaticized on the subject of the American flag. They are no less determined to associate it with the cause of war than was the Bishop of Asaph to associate the English version of the Bible with the fiends of hell.

The champion of the cause of peace who undertakes to associate the American flag with the gospel of Jesus finds the militarist hounding him to the very altar. The American flag, it seems, must be used in the churches of the land only in accordance with a militarized procedure, dictated through the War Department. There is something curiously like the tactics of the enemies of the English Bible in the doings of the "majors" and "captains" and other martinets who now bully American communities in the name of the American flag.

One might suspect that the American flag exhaled a baneful vapor when dissociated from the purpose of war, when used in festoons to drape an altar or when waved in any fashion not "authorized" by the "rules" of the War Department. It might even be inferred from an episode here and there that emissaries of the War Department had been hired to create ill will for the American flag among the people who worship in Christian churches. The spirit is like that of the ecclesiastics who searched Oxford and Cambridge and London for copies of the Bible in English. The Bible must not be used by the vulgar except in the fashion prescribed by the ecclesiastics. In the same way the American flag is not to be used by Christians in their churches unless they consent to militarize the whole etiquette of it by adopting the "rules" of the War Department.

If history had not taught mankind the spirit that is behind the militarist, his browbeating of some communities through the medium of the American flag might tax the credulity of Bottom the Weaver. The situation is indeed growing worse than that which confronted the Londoners when the Bishop of that city enjoined on his archdeacons the seizure of all translations of the New Testament into English.

The militarists are naturally terrorized at the prospect that the American flag may yet be dissociated from the cause of war, that it may cease to be an emblem of a pagan Mars and be employed as a drapery of a Christian tabernacle.

Hence Congress should be thanked for its failure to pass any measure establishing by law a militarized etiquette for the stars and stripes and enforcing that etiquette upon Christians under penalty of imprisonment. The militarists are for the moment embarrassed by the absence of this kind of a statute from the federal laws. They enjoy a certain advantage in their browbeating because of the popular ignorance of the legal aspect of the subject. Their attitude is precisely that of the English archbishop. "My diocese," said he, "is encumbered with such as read the Bible. We must have greater authority to punish than we have." The militarists are accordingly frustrated by those who drape their altars with the American flag. They must have authority from Congress to stop the practice.

Nothing could be more pleasing to an educated taste than the civilian etiquette of the American flag as it has developed in the last century among the friends of peace. Indeed, association of the American flag with the cause of peace among men has been promoted of late. But the theory of the militarist that the stars and stripes comprise an emblem of war is dominant in the land. The circumstance that the etiquette of the flag is relegated to the War Department explains everything. A battle royal will yet have to be fought before the militarists will permit control of the etiquette of the American flag to be taken from them. Association of the American flag with the cause of peace instead of with war would be to modern mankind what the conversion of Paul was to the Christians at Damascus.

No historian tells us just why the militarists have been enabled to take the etiquette of the American flag under their control. If the etiquette could be taken out of the bureaucratic rulings of the War Department as far as the civilian population is concerned, the militarists would have no excuse for bullying every man, woman and child who loves the emblem of his native land. As long as the War Department "rules" prevail, the martinet mood will dominate the land and disseminate its tyrannies all over the country. Instances multiply.

For one thing, it does not occur to many of our citizens that the etiquette of the country's flag need not be determined for them by militarists. The super-

intendents of Sunday Schools, the pastors of churches and the friends of peace on earth must combine against this exploitation of the stars and stripes by militarized politics.

Quite recently, a champion of the militarized etiquette protested to the authorities of a certain American community against what he termed "the practice of decorating buildings with the American flag made into folds and festoons." This practice, he thundered, "flagrantly violated the rules." He did not condescend to state how the rules came into being, who made them nor why the etiquette they specified should be fashioned for civilians by the makers of war.

The militarist who thus used the name of the War Department to sanction his "rules" called himself a "Major." Whether he is in the regular army or not does not matter. He had the public authorities of the community apologizing to him because of one practice in the town.

The church people had ventured to drape the American flag upon their altars! This, the champion of militarism affirmed in brazen accents, was "wrong." With lungs of brass he cited the "rules." These "rules," he told the city fathers of the town, they must procure from the War Department. He had to admit that nobody could be arrested for not obeying the "rules." It was hinted that Congress might yet atone for its remissness here.

One of the martinets did concede that the draping of the flag in the churches and elsewhere had an effect somewhat prettier than the appearance the stars and stripes presented according to the "rules." Still, a War Department is a War Department, the idea being that the American flag exists for the War Department. The city fathers thought that the draped flag must be taken out of the churches altogether, but a certain "major," more experienced than the other one, conceded that it was "permissible" to place the flag over an altar and lay a Bible on it. But the "rules" do not tolerate the practice of many pious people who attain aesthetic effects with the draped emblem. The flag must be used in flat violation of the laws of aesthetics when the "rules" of the War Department so provide.

The militarists said they would get the "rules" governing display of the American flag from the War Department at Washington and have them distributed in the town. It never even remotely occurred to any of the city fathers that the etiquette of the American flag could possibly be anything but a militarized one. The State Department does not display the American flag in accordance with a militarized etiquette. Why should any civilian? Those who have striven to disassociate the American flag in the minds of American children from the idea of war know how unfortunate is the effect upon them of the attitude rightly or wrongly ascribed to the War Department.

It is quite proper, doubtless, for the War Department to lay down its rules for those who are officially connected with it. It seems incredible that the bureaucrats of the War Department feel authorized to prescribe an etiquette for civilians in anything relating to the flag. Certainly, nothing could so promote the idea of peace in the national mind as the disassociation of the civilian etiquette of the American flag from the militarism of the War Department. If the American people are not to use their flag as their patriotism suggests, if they are to be compelled to cover their altars with it only in accordance with militarist ideas, then we ought to erase from the national constitution the amendment on the subject of freedom of conscience.

What the American people ought to understand is that the War Department has no right whatever to militarize the etiquette of the flag except for the army. Many regard the American flag with all the love and veneration cherished for it by any militarist but they prefer to drape it in accordance with the symbolism of peace. The symbolism of war may be all well enough for those who believe in war, but not all believe in war. Yet whenever the American flag is displayed the militarists assume the right to dictate the manner of that display.

How would the militarists feel if the men of peace undertook the dictate to them? What would they say if the pacifists introduced into Congress a bill to take the whole subject of the etiquette of the American flag for civilian use out of the hands of the War Department? Why should a "major" have more to say about the draping of the American flag upon an altar than the pastor of the church? Surely there is nothing in the gospel of Jesus Christ to degrade the American flag even when the stars and stripes are draped upon an altar.

There is a parallel to the attitude of the militarists towards the American flag in the hands of the American people. That parallel, as I have said, is found in the attitude of the ecclesiastical martinets towards the English Bible in the hands of the English people. The mood of the bureaucrats in the War Department must be that of the notorious Edward Lee, Archbishop of York, when he remarked concerning the New Testament in English: "If we do not stop this leak, it will sink the ship." No wonder the wagers of war are determined to retain their control of the etiquette of the American flag.

ALEXANDER HARVEY.

Causes in Evolution

Accepting the fact of Orderly Change, universal, so far as we can trace the relations of cause and effect and of natural sequence, we face the more difficult problems as to how changes are brought about. Here we no longer find unanimity of opinion, for in the myriad of facts at our disposal, no single man can master their prodigious range. A forest is not the same to a lumberman as to a landscape gardener. A primrose is not the same in a greenhouse as by the river's brim. The "harvest of the quiet eye" is not the one gathered in by the reaper. The microscope and the telescope gather knowledge from different angles. But the lesson of all science is that whatever takes place in nature is natural, not supernatural. "Supernatural" is indeed to science a meaningless word. It concerns either nothing at all or something not found out.

DAVID STARR JORDAN.

The Story of My Experiments with Truth

[The Autobiography of Mahatma Gandhi]

(Copyright, 1928)

PART IV—CHAPTERS XXXV AND XXXVI

Tares Among the Wheat

It was at Tolstoy Farm that Mr. Kallenbach drew my attention to a problem that had never before struck me. As I have already said, some of the boys at the Farm were bad and unruly. There were loafers, too, among them. With these my three boys came in daily contact, as also did other children of the same type as my own sons. This troubled Mr. Kallenbach, but his attention was centered on the impropriety of keeping *my* boys with those unruly youngsters.

One day he spoke out: "Your way of mixing your own boys with the bad ones does not appeal to me. It can have only one result. They will become demoralized through this bad company."

I do not remember whether the question puzzled me at the moment, but I recollect what I said to him:

"How can I distinguish between my boys and the loafers? I am equally responsible for both. The youngsters have come because I invited them. If I were to dismiss them with some money, they would immediately run off to Johannesburg and fall back into their old ways. To tell you the truth, it is quite likely that they and their guardians believe that by having come here they have laid me under an obligation. That they have to put up with a good deal of inconvenience here, you and I know very well. But my duty is clear. I must have them here, and therefore my boys also must needs live with them. And surely you do not want me to teach my boys to feel from today that they are superior to other boys. To put that sense of superiority into their heads would be to lead them astray. This association with other boys will be a good discipline for them, and they will, of their own accord, learn to discriminate between good and evil. Why should we not believe that if there is really anything good in them, it is bound to react on their companions? However that may be, I cannot help keeping them here, and if that means some risk, we must run it."

Mr. Kallenbach shook his head.

The result, I think, cannot be said to have been bad. I do not consider my sons were any the worse for the experiment. In fact, I can see that they gained something. If there was the slightest trace of superiority in them, it was destroyed and they learned to mix with all kinds of children. They were tested and disciplined.

This and similar experiments have shown me that if good children are taught together with bad ones and thrown into their company, they will lose nothing, provided the experiment is conducted under the watchful care of their parents and guardians.

It does not necessarily follow that children wrapped up in cottonwool are proof to all temptation or contamination. It is true, however, that when boys and girls of all kinds of upbringing are kept and taught together the parents and the teachers are put to the severest test. They have continually to be on the *qui vive*.

Fasting as Penance

It became increasingly clear to me, day by day, how very difficult it was to bring up and educate boys and girls in the right way. If I was to be their real teacher and guardian, I must touch their hearts, I must share their joys and sorrows, I must help them to solve the problems that faced them, I must take along the right channel the surging aspirations of their youth.

On the release of some of the Satyagrahis from jail, Tolstoy Farm was nearly denuded of its inmates. The few that remained mainly belonged to Phœnix. So I removed them to Phœnix. Here I had to pass through a fiery ordeal. I had to move between Johannesburg and Phœnix. Once when I was in Johannesburg I received the tidings of the moral fall of two of the inmates of the Ashram. News of an apparent failure or reverse in the Satyagraha struggle would not shock me, but this news came upon me like a thunderbolt. The same day I took the train for Phœnix. Mr. Kallenbach insisted on accompanying me. He had noticed the state I was in. He would not brook the thought of my going alone, for he happened to be the bearer of the tidings which had so upset me.

On the way my duty became, or I thought had become, clear to me. I felt that the guardian or the teacher was responsible, to some extent at least, for the lapse of his ward or pupil. My responsibility in the matter in question became therefore clear to me as daylight. My wife had already warned me in this behalf, but being of a trusting nature I had ignored her warning. I also felt that the parties to the guilt could be made to realize my distress, and the depth of their fall, only if I did some penance for it. So I imposed upon myself a fast for seven days and a vow of having only one meal a day for a period of four months and a half. Mr. Kallenbach tried to dissuade me, but in vain. He ultimately accepted the propriety of the penance, and insisted on joining me. I could not resist his transparent affection.

The decision meant a heavy load off my mind, and I felt considerably relieved. The anger against the guilty parties subsided, and gave place to the purest pity for them. Thus considerably relieved, I reached Phœnix. I made further investigation and acquainted myself with some more details I needed to know. My penance pained everybody, but it cleared the atmosphere. Every one came to realise what a terrible thing it was to be sinful, and the bond that bound me to the boys and girls became stronger and truer.

A circumstance arising out of this incident compelled me, a little while after, to go into a fast for fourteen days, the results of which exceeded even my expectations.

It is not my purpose to make out from these incidents that it is the duty of a teacher to resort to fasting whenever there is a delinquency on the part of his pupils. But I hold that some occasions do call for this drastic remedy. But it presupposes clearness of vision and spiritual fitness. Where there is no true

love between the teacher and the pupil, where the pupil's delinquency has not touched the very being of the teacher, where the pupil has no respect for the teacher, fasting is out of place and may even be harmful. Though there is thus room for doubting the propriety of fasts in such cases, there is no question about the teacher's responsibility for the errors of his pupil.

The first penance did not prove difficult for any of us. I had to suspend or stop none of my normal activities. And it may be recalled that during the whole of this period of penance I was a strict fruitarian. The latter part of the second fast went fairly hard with me. I had not then completely understood the wonderful efficacy of *Ramanama,* and my capacity for suffering was to that extent less. I did not know too the technique of fasting, especially the necessity of drinking plenty of water, however nauseating or distasteful it may be. And then the fact that the first fast had been an easy affair had made me rather careless as to the second. Thus during the first I took Kuhne baths every day. During the second, I gave them up after two or three days, and I drank very little water, as it was distasteful and produced nausea. The throat became parched and weak and during the last days I could speak only in a very low voice. In spite of this, however, my work was carried on through dictation where writing was necessary. I regularly listened to readings from the Ramayana and other sacred books. I had also sufficient strength to discuss and advise in all urgent matters.

M. K. GANDHI.

(*Translated from Navajivan by Mahadeo Desai.*)

The Study Table

Spanish America

A remarkable enterprise, which is apparently meeting with success, is the magazine *Mexican Folkways,*[1] published six times a year in the City of Mexico, under editorship of Frances Toor, with the art features directed by the well known Mexican, Diego Rivera. Excellently printed, amply and appropriately illustrated, its material is the folk-lore of Mexico. Otis I. Mason divided the content of folk-lore into folk-thought, folk-speech and folk-wont. Miss Toor includes them all in folk-ways. Herself an admirer of Mexico and the Mexicans, with especial sympathy for the Indian, a keen observer and an interesting narrator, she contributes new and valuable material to each number. She has gathered around her a group of a dozen writers—Mexican, American, German—who speak with authority upon Mexican thought and customs. Most of the articles so far published have been printed in both English and Spanish. They deal with a wide range of subjects. Especial attention is given to festivals, to folk-songs and music and to the flying-sheets or broadsides so popular in Mexico. Nowhere else, so far as I know, can one find so much authoritative material regarding the movement in Mexico towards a new and characteristic national art. Everyone has heard something of Diego Rivera and his work has been exhibited in a number of our cities. The mural decorations at the building of the Ministry of Public Instruction, done under his direction, have caused a veritable sensation. But Rivera, although the leader and most prominent artist in the movement toward national art expression, is but one of a considerable group. Prominent among them is Maximo Pacheco, Otomi Indian, whose work and ideals are here made known. The natural art-expression of school children is just now attracting attention in various countries, among them our own. This interest was aroused early in Mexico and in *Mexican Folkways* one may keep in touch with its development. In other words, this magazine is filled with information, not to be found elsewhere. It is now in its third volume and deserves the heartiest of support. Its price is so modest—only $2 American per year—that it should have a large circulation. We need it here in the United States, where more than elsewhere a knowledge of the spiritual movement in Mexico is of great importance. It should be on file in every important public library in our country.

It is natural that just now, when we are intervening by force in Nicaragua, when we have assumed the responsibility of conducting "a fair election," when we have had a special representative of the president forcing disarmament under threat, when we have dropped bombs upon the hiding places of patriots whom we are pleased to consider bandits—killing men, women and children, there should be an abundance of printed matter regarding that Central American republic. In this deluge of printed matter there are a number of books, some of them important. Perhaps the most valuable is Prof. Cox's "Nicaragua and the United States,"[2] a World Peace Foundation book. Prof. Cox has been especially interested in Latin America for many years. He has a judicial attitude and aims to be fair. He gives us an excellent summary of our relations with Nicaragua through a score of years. We have really been "intervening" in that unfortunate country ever since 1907. In 1905 and 1906 there were troubles in Central America in which we were so greatly interested that we encouraged the contending leaders to adjust their difficulties by a conference upon one of our war-vessels. Soon afterward the Washington Conference of 1907 upon Central American affairs was held. It was largely on account of his attitude to that meeting that our growing dislike of President Zelaya of Nicaragua came to a head. A little later we encouraged and aided the revolution that overthrew him and drove him into exile. It is common for Americans to belittle Zelaya; our statesmen and publicists have seen little good and much bad in him. There are, however, two sides to the Zelaya question. Our intervention at that time was the natural prelude to all that has happened since. For twenty years we have dictated the policies of Nicaragua. With the downfall of Zelaya the affairs of the republic have been controlled by American money interests. We have been there twenty years; we are likely to remain there another twenty, unless the League of Nations or a rising tide of hostility throughout Latin America forces us to loosen our hold. Do not think for an instant that Prof. Cox indulges in any such rabid statement as you have just read. Far

1. **Mexican Folkways.** Edited by Frances Toor. (Apartado postal 1994), City of Mexico. Published every two months.

2. **Nicaragua and the United States.** Isaac Joplin Cox. Boston: 1927. World Peace Foundation. 16mo., pp. 703-887.

from it. He gives a thoughtful, balanced, well-documented statement of the whole matter. In five chapters he treats of the background of intervention, fiscal and military intervention, intervention and unionism, the renewal of the Washington pact, civil strife and the second intervention. In appendices, the important documents are given, from the rupture of diplomatic relations with Zelaya in 1909 up to the present. We have said that Prof. Cox aims to be fair; he is conservative and omits now and again matter that might better be said. This bias makes the admissions, which from time to time he is forced to make, so much the stronger. The book is a handy book for ready reference. It is not only the best book that has appeared on the subject, it is likely to remain so.

Quite different in every way is Rafael de Nogales' "The Looting of Niacaragua."[3] The author was in the Great War, in the employ of Turkey, and has narrated his experiences in a book called "Four Years Beneath the Crescent." A Venezuelan by birth, he has the viewpoint and appreciates the attitude of Latin America towards this whole business of intervention. In speaking of the plight of Nicaragua he says:

> These are matters which are being freely discussed all over the world. Except in the United States. It is in the interest of Dollar Diplomacy not to let the American people know the truth about what is really going on south of the Rio Grande.

The author went to Niacaragua in 1927 to see conditions for himself and came into personal contact with many of the leaders. He met Dr. Sacasa and his cabinet as well as many of the military men. He does not consider Sacasa a strong man, nor likely to make a success as a political leader. Still less does he like Moncada, whom Mr. Stimson chose to consider the head of the anti-government forces. De Nogales considers him neither a soldier nor a progressive politician; he holds that he has played the traitor and betrayed the trust placed in him. Our author's opinion may be gained from this question—"what could be expected from a crooked politician and a Conservative renegade of the type of Moncada, who has succeeded in outdoing in baseness and abjectness even Adolfo Diaz?" He is probably right in holding that Sacasa and Moncada are both so closely related to the old conditions that there is no hope of either of them leading the country into paths of actual progress. This is a matter of consequence, as it is quite possible that we may aid to seat Moncada in the presidential chair. That he is not a man of principle and would willingly be a tool of foreign interests seems true. De Nogales has confidence in Sandino. He is a true patriot, with forward vision. We are little likely to permit him to reach a position where he could help his people forward. Ever since we drove out Zelaya, we have prevented any qualified actual leader to come into power. De Nogales illustrates his book with many interesting pictures of revolutionary leaders and victims of intervention. His narrative is lively and personal; it is discursive rather than a well-knit analysis and argument. In his attack on Dollar Diplomacy, the author often goes far outside his Nicaraguan field. As an expression of Latin-American sentiment the book has a real value.

In Lawrence's "Mornings in Mexico"[4] only 96 out of the 189 pages are devoted to Mexico; 83 pages deal with New Mexico and Arizona; 10, let us say, are given over to a maudlin night in Italy, with the pretense of a New Mexican nostalgia as a result of the alcoholic indulgence. Mr. Lawrence is really much more at home in England than in Mexico. He breathes more freely there, is less troubled with bile. In Mexico he suffered all the time; in New Mexico and Arizona he felt safer, more nearly normal. The Indian of southern Mexico was a sphynx, who worried him. He could stand the pueblo Indian of the north much better—he almost had glimpses of understanding him. There is not much in the book to repay the reader, but the descriptions, the attempted explanations, the reactions to the dance of the sprouting corn (was it at Santo Domingo?) and the snake dance of the Hopi, go far to redeem the book.

FREDERICK STARR.

3. **The Looting of Nicaragua.** Rafael de Nogales. New York: 1928. Robert M. McBride & Co., 16mo, pp. xi-304.

4. **Mornings in Mexico.** D. H. Lawrence. New York: 1928. Alfred A. Knopf. 16mo, pp. 189.

An Anthology of Obscure Poets

This* is a great idea that Harry Kemp had—to reverse the ordinary anthological procedure by collecting specimens of the writings of obscure rather than famous poets, and then calling his collection, after the example of Palgrave's "Golden Treasury," a *"Bronze* Treasury." The result—partly because of the idea, and partly also because of the novel way in which it is carried out—is one of the most attractive and entertaining books that we have ever seen.

The poets are all English poets, most of them unquestionably obscure, some of them long since forgotten and now only rescued by the editor's diligence and care, but a few of them neither obscure nor forgotten but just neglected. In this last class are such not unfamiliar names as John Skelton, Michael Drayton, Samuel Johnson, Mark Akenside, Erasmus Darwin, Hartley Taylor Coleridge, Thomas Beddoes, Philip James Bailey, Coventry Patmore, Sydney Dobell, and Sir Lewis Morris. But the collection is accurately named; it is prevailingly not gold, nor even silver, but "bronze." Yet it is none the less interesting on this account.

As attractive as the material of the volume is, its unique handling by the editor is even more so. Thus, Harry Kemp has not been willing to gather together his poetic selections, and deck them out with a few dates, comments, and biographical notes. On the contrary, he has made his poets quite as important as their poetry by writing sketches of their lives and personalities which are as fascinating as they are informing. We don't know when we have read anything more delightful than these biographical introductions. Of course, about some of these obscure authors, such as Patrick Carey, Charles Montague, Selwyn Image, and the ever-present Anon., there was little and sometimes nothing to say. But of others there was a good deal to say, and Kemp says it easily, wittily, happily. We cite the sketches of Philip James Bailey, and of Coventry Patmore as perfect specimens of their kind. Incidentally, we are grateful to Kemp for recognizing and emphasizing the great qualities in the unjustly neglected author of "Festus."

We have long been an enthusiastic collector of anthologies. It is a long time since we have added to our collection a more welcome or valuable volume than this.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

***The Bronze Treasury,** edited by Harry Kemp. Published by the Macauley Company.

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

INTERNATIONAL CRIME

In the hope that the world is about to recognize law as the basis for civilized intercourse, there is need of determining what national activities are to be prohibited and what punishment shall be meted out to offenders. Professor Albert Levitt has formulated a Code of International Criminal Law which has just been published in pamphlet form by the *Arbitrator,* 114 East 31st Street, New York City. Its novel characteristics may be realized from the following extracts:

The purpose of this Code of International Criminal Law is to protect States and their nationals from injuries to their existence, persons, property and relations with each other. No activity by a State or its nationals shall be deemed an international crime unless it is declared to be so by this Code.

The following activities by any State are declared to be international crimes and are hereby forbidden.

1. Aggressive war by one State upon another State. (Aggressive war exists when the armed forces of a State are upon the territory of another State with hostile intent.)

2. Instigating a State to enter into an aggressive war upon another State.

3. Aiding or abetting, in any way, one State in its aggressive war upon another State.

4. Furnishing, in any manner or at any time, munitions of war to another State.

5. Furnishing, in any manner or at any time, munitions of war to any person or group within another State.

6. Armed intervention, in any form, in the political affairs of another State.

7. Fomenting, instigating, aiding or abetting, in any manner, a political revolution within another State. (This section shall not be interpreted to deny the right to revolution to the nationals of any State; nor shall it be interpreted to deny the right of one State to recognize a successful revolutionary party in another State.)

8. Violation of its obligations under any treaty or treaties into which it has lawfully entered.

(Treaties or parts of treaties which are inconsistent with the provisions of this Code are hereby abrogated.)

9. Interference, by force, with the ships or trade of another State.

10. Instigating its nationals to commit, or aiding or abetting its nationals in the commission of an international crime as defined in Article Three of this Code.

11. Failure to punish its nationals who have committed an international crime, as defined by Article Three of this Code, when the duty to punish such nationals has devolved upon it.

12. Treatment of its own nationals, or the nationals of another State, in a cruel, barbarous or uncivilized manner.

The following activities by the nationals of any State are declared to be international crimes and are hereby forbidden.

1. Piracy.

2. Participation in any capacity whatever in any war of aggression in the armed forces of a foreign State.

3. Selling to, or buying from, any foreign State or national of any foreign State, arms or munitions of war.

4. Participation, in any capacity whatever, in any internal insurrection or revolution in a foreign State.

5. Instigating, or aiding or abetting, in any way, an internal insurrection or revolution in a foreign State.

6. Violating any treaty right of the nationals of a foreign state.

7. Abuse of privileges by a diplomatic agent of any State.

8. Counterfeiting the coinage of a foreign State.

9. Counterfeiting the evidences of the public indebtedness of a foreign State.

10. Engaging in an international traffic in human beings for immoral purposes.

11. Engaging in an international traffic in opium, or any other narcotic drug, except those which are intended for religious, industrial, or medicinal purposes.

12. Engaging in an international traffic in alcoholic liquors, except those alcoholic liquors which are intended for religious, industrial or medicinal uses.

13. Smuggling human beings into a foreign State.

14. Smuggling into a foreign State any article of commerce or commodity which has been forbidden entry by that State.

15. Killing the nationals of a foreign State.

16. Participation in an international scheme to defraud any foreign State or the nationals of a foreign State.

17. Disseminating false news about a foreign State which embroils that State in an international dispute, or difficulty, or aggressive war.

18. Violation of the domestic laws governing industrial and commercial concessions of a foreign State while within the territory of that State.

A Permanent Court of International Criminal Justice is proposed, before which any State may be summoned and by whose judges individuals guilty of breaking international law may be punished.

The following penalties are applicable to States that have been found guilty of committing an international crime:

(a) Breaking off of diplomatic relations.

(b) Warning that diplomatic relations will be severed.

(c) Withdrawal, in whole or in part, of diplomatic privileges and immunities of officials and agents.

(d) Revocation of exequator granted to consuls.

(e) Curtailment, in whole or in part, of the right to benefit under international agreements.

(f) Sequestration of property belonging to the guilty State which may be found in the other States.

(g) Sequestration of property belonging to the nationals of the guilty State which may be found in the territories of the other States.

(h) Withdrawal from the nationals of the guilty State of the rights of industrial, literary, artistic, scientific and other property.

(i) Depriving the guilty State or the nationals of the guilty State of the right to sue and be sued in the courts of the other States.

(j) Depriving the nationals of the guilty State of all civil rights in the other States.

(k) Economic boycott of the guilty State by the other States.

(l) Embargo against the guilty State by the other States.

PRAYERS

"A choice collection of the lyrical and inspiring prayers that sprang with such spontaneity from the heart and soul of Jenkin Lloyd Jones."—C. W. R.

"Beautiful, simple, dignified, spiritual. I do not know when I have been so impressed."—H. S. N.

"Tender, wonderfully human and wonderfully comforting and uplifting."—J. T. S.

"When life runs deep below the surface, the abiding faith in love and justice and the tender enfolding Fatherhood voiced in these prayers will bring comfort and courage."—O. C. S.

By JENKIN LLOYD JONES

Published by The Beacon Press, Boston, Mass.

Price $1.50

ABRAHAM LINCOLN CENTRE,
730 Oakwood Boulevard,
Chicago.

I enclose $.....for.....copies of Prayers by Jenkin Lloyd Jones.

NAME .....

STREET .....

CITY..... STATE.....

(m) Refusal to furnish materials to the guilty State by the other States.

(n) Refusal to furnish loans to the guilty State by the other States.

(o) Increasing customs duties on the products coming from the guilty State by the other States.

(p) Prohibiting the nationals of any State from giving financial assistance of any sort or in any manner to the guilty State.

(q) Withdrawing from the guilty State or the Nationals of the guilty State, facilities of communication, transportation and commerce within the territories of the other States.

(r) Imposing upon the guilty State the duty of making reparations for any injury it may have caused another State or the nationals of another State.

The following penalties are applicable to individuals who have been found guilty of committing international crimes.

(a) Admonition.
(b) Fine.
(c) Imprisonment.
(d) Exile.
(e) Prohibition of residence.
(f) Withdrawal of civil rights in the offender's own State.
(g) Withdrawal of civil rights of the offender in the territory of the State which has been injured.
(h) Withdrawal of the civil rights of the offender in the territory of the State whose national has been injured.
(i) Withdrawal of the civil rights of the offender in the territory of the State within which the offense was committed.
(j) Cancellation of industrial, mining, commercial or other concessions within the territory of the State which has been injured and the State within which the offense was committed.
(k) Imposing the duty upon the offender to make reparation to any State or the national of any state whom he has injured.

It shall be the duty of the League of Nations to see that the sentences imposed by the Permanent Court of International Criminal Justice are carried out by the several States in their respective territories.

* * *

A French Petition

Fifty-five students of Lyons have sent to the Minister of War a petition for the release of Georges Chevé, who was condemned to six months' imprisonment for having refused military service on conscientious grounds. These students represent every shade of religion and politics, and they voice the hope that France, following the example of other civilized nations, as, for instance, England and Sweden will give legal recognition to conscientious objection to military service. (*l'Oeuvre, January 3, 1928.*)

FOR RENT

Sussex County, N. J. Part of remodeled farm house. Brook through woods, large barn, orchard, partly furnished. Rent for season or year.

Apply M. H. Andrews,
46 E. Blackwell St., Dover, N. J.

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

3913 Cottage Grove
Tel. Atlantic 1876

THE HIGH SIERRAS CALL!

Visit the uninhabited mountain regions of California, loved by John Muir.

Leave civilization behind for two, four, six weeks.

Join a congenial camping and hiking party in charge of two teachers, readers of UNITY. Forget newspapers, telephones, radios, autos.

Enjoy fishing, pack trains, camp fires, companionship.

For full information address

Elmo A. Robinson
Box 719
Menlo Park, Cal.

MAY

Is the month for the year's greatest cleaning. The home's cold weather drapes and rugs, blankets and comforters, heavy motor robes, should all be cleansed before putting them away. Summer cretonnes and slip covers should be made ready for service. Send work here in confidence of its being done by the latest equipment and methods.

Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers

PHONE DREXEL 6181 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

THE AMERICAN DISCOVERY OF RUSSIA— SUMMER OF 1928

The two greatest nations on earth no longer know each other. Volumes have been written. But in the past ten years a mere handful of American social workers, writers, and business men, has seen revolutionary Russia. Still fewer Russians have visited America. A Russian or American in the other's country has the status of a visitor from Mars.

Last summer two parties of American students and intellectual workers, men and women, toured Russia through the instrumentality of the National Student Federation of America and the Open Road. The same organizations are again sending a few groups. Each will comprise eight members under the leadership of an informed American, and will be accompanied in Russia by a Russian interpreter.

Time in Russia: 3, 4, 5 or 6 weeks: Prices, New York to New York: $725, up. Sailings: June 16, 23, 30 and July 7. Visas: Applications through the Open Road.

THE OPEN ROAD, INC
2 West 46 St., New York

Phone Oakland 489 **JANITORS' SUPPLIES**

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.